submitted that the above-referenced Information Disclosure Statement was properly filed on May 22, 2002, and should be accorded its filing date for the purposes of consideration and compliance with 37 CFR §§ 1.97 and 1.98. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 23-32 are pending in the present application, of which claim 23 is independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action continues to reject claims 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In other words, the Official Action asserts that the specification lacks support for the claims.

Please incorporate the arguments presented at pages 2-3 of the Response filed February 25, 2005 (received by OIPE February 28, 2005).

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Official Action asserts that "Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/05 have been fully considered" (emphasis added), that the Applicants' chart provided with the Response filed February 25, 2005, "refers to application 08/504225; not the current application 08/841644" and that since "the Applicant's arguments are based on a different patent application they are not persuasive to overcome the Examiner's 112 rejection" (pages 3-4, Paper No. 051605). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As explained in detail in the previously filed Response, "the specification of the subject application must be the same as the '225 application." It appears that the Examiner has overlooked the clear relationship between the present application and the '225 application.

- 3 -

To summarize, the present application is a Rule 60 divisional application based on the '225 application. As noted in the *Response* filed February 25, 2005, the chart submitted in the *Response* is the same chart that was attached to the *Preliminary Amendment Under 37 CFR § 1.607 and Notification of Other Amendments under 37 § 1.607 in Related Patent Applications* filed April 30, 1997, and the chart was relied upon to initiate an interference with U.S. Patent No. 5,383,366 to Nakazawa. The present specification is identical to the specification in the '225 application. The citations to the specification in the Applicants' chart provided with the *Response* filed February 25, 2005, apply to the present specification. Therefore, the Applicants <u>again</u> respectfully submit that the pending claims are well supported by the subject application since the specification of the subject application must be the same as the '225 application.

Since the *Response* filed February 25, 2005, was fully responsive to the rejection based on § 112, since the relationship between the present application and the '225 application should have been readily apparent to the Examiner and since the chart was already of record in the present application, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the holding of finality pursuant to MPEP § 706.07(d).

In view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the subject application are fully and completely supported in accord with 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in view of the above and the previously submitted detailed support is requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Robinson

Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C. PMB 955 21010 Southbank Street

Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165

(571) 434-6789